

- Sub
B1
Q2
16. (Once amended) A computerized system comprising:
a processor and a computer-readable medium;
an operating environment executing on the processor from the computer-readable medium; and
a project tracking system operative to maintain versions of project data comprising at least one project data element.
17. (Once amended) The computerized system of claim 16, wherein the project tracking system comprises:
a visual interface operative to display the project data and receive an update to the project data element; and
a project database operative to store a new version of project data upon receipt of an update to the project data element.

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,890,166 to Eisenberg et al. (hereinafter "Eisenberg"). The examiner has rejected claims 19-24¹ under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Eisenberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,890,166 to Bereiter et al. (hereinafter "Bereiter"). Claim 8 has been cancelled. Applicants maintain the patentability of claim 8 but have cancelled this claim to expedite prosecution of the present application. Claims 9, 16, and 17 have been amended only to clarify the claims, and thereby place them in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 as being anticipated by Eisenberg. Applicant respectfully and submits that claims 1-7 and 9-18 are patentable over the art

¹ While the Office Action Summary indicates that claim 24 is objected to, this objection is not apparent in the Office Action. Additionally, while the statement of rejection on page 5 of the office action refers only to claims 19-23, paragraph 10 of the office action appears to address claim 24.

of record because claims 1-7 and 9-18 recite features that are not disclosed or suggested by Eisenberg, as set forth below.

Claims 1 through 7 and 9 through 15

Claims 1 and 9 include features neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely “saving a previous version of the project data, wherein the previous version contains a value of the at least one project data attribute prior to the update.”

The Examiner contends that the above feature is anticipated by Eisenberg, at column 5, lines 23-27. This is where Eisenberg discusses the “commit” request, which applies a set of requested data alterations to existing data. However, this does not indicate the storage of the existing data (the “previous version”) but only that a new version is produced. Contrary to the Examiner’s contention, no “saving a previous version of the project data” is disclosed or suggested, as required by the claims.

Moreover, Applicants contend that projects in Eisenberg are completely different from projects as discussed by Applicants in their application. However, to the extent that projects exist in Eisenberg, a project is represented by a “variant domain”. A variant domain contains “parts” and a project may need “parts” from other variant domains (Eisenberg, column 29, lines 22-25 and 37-41).

However, the claimed “previous version of project data” and “current version of project data” are not discussed or disclosed in Eisenberg. In Eisenberg, versions of variant domains are not stored. Only versions of “parts” (which may constitute variant domains) are seen. Part revisions are discussed at column 15, lines 4 through column 16, line 56 of Eisenberg.

Therefore claims 1 and 9 and their dependent claims 2-7 and 10-15 are distinguished from and not anticipated by Eisenberg. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

Claims 16 through 18

Claim 16, as amended, includes the feature of a project tracking system operative to maintain versions of project data comprising at least one project data element. As discussed above, the Eisenberg invention does not maintain versions of project data, but rather maintains versions of “parts”. Therefore claim 16 and its dependent claims 17 and 18 are distinguished from and not anticipated by Eisenberg.

The Examiner directs Applicants' attention to column 18, lines 10-20 of Eisenberg. However, while multiple versions of "part" data (which a project may be comprised of) are discussed, this section of Eisenberg does not discuss storing versions of project data, as set forth in the Applicants' claims.

Therefore claim 16 and its dependent claims 17 and 18 are distinguished from and not anticipated by Eisenberg. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable by Eisenberg in view of Bereiter. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-24 are patentable over the art of record for the following reasons because claims 19-24 recite features that are not disclosed or suggested either explicitly or inherently by the combination of Eisenberg in view of Bereiter, as set forth below.

Claims 19-24 include features neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely "reading a selected property value for the selected version" and "reading a second property value for at least one other version of project data."

As discussed above, reading of versions of project data is not found in Eisenberg. Nor are versions which can be read found in Bereiter.

Additionally, the selection of a property value and a version is not found in Eisenberg or Bereiter. Examiner directs Applicants' attention to column 21, lines 12-13 for the claim limitation of "reading a selected property value for the selected version." However, the description in column 21 is of a user selecting a revision for parts. No selection of a property value is discussed in Eisenberg. Eisenberg discusses looking for parts with a revision R2, and if no such revision exists for a part exist, looking for a revision R1. No "property value" or property of the parts is being selected, only a revision.

Claim 19 and its dependent claim includes "a selected version of the project data" and "a selected property value for the selected version." Only one selection is made in Eisenberg – the selection of a revision. Additionally, only revisions of parts and not versions of projects are being selected.

Claim 19 also includes the limitation "comparing the selected property value to the second property value." As no property value is selected in Eisenberg, this comparison can not be seen in that reference. As to claims 19-23, while Bereiter does disclose highlighting or displaying a glyph to associate two graphical elements (a node and a region), it does not include the selection of a property value in a selected version of project data and the comparison of that property value to other values stored in other versions of project data, as claimed in claim 19.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19 through 23 are patentably distinct and allowable over Eisenberg in view of Bereiter. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections of claims 19-23.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submit that the present application, including amended claims 9, 16, and 17, is in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is entitled "**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**".

Respectfully submitted,



Sharon Fenick
Registration No. 45,269

Date: January 23, 2002

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place – 46th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**IN THE CLAIMS:**

Please cancel claim 8 without prejudice.

Please amend claims 9, 16, and 17 as follows:

9. (Once amended) A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for maintaining version of project data, the project data having at least one project data attribute, said computer-executable instructions performing a [the] method comprising:

receiving an updated value for the project data attribute;

saving a previous version of the project data, wherein the previous version contains a value of the at least one project data attribute prior to the update; and

creating a current version of the project data, wherein the current version of the project data contains the updated value.

16. (Once amended) A computerized system comprising:

a processor and a computer-readable medium;

an operating environment executing on the processor from the computer-readable medium; and

a project tracking system operative to maintain versions of project data comprising at least one project data element [associated with a project, the data associated with a project including a project data element].

17. (Once amended) The computerized system of claim 16, wherein the project tracking system comprises:

a visual interface operative to display the project data [associated with the project] and receive an update to the project data element; and

a project database operative to store a new version of project data [associated with a project] upon receipt of an update to the project data element.